

REMARKS

Applicants' representative would like to thank Examiner Ton for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview on February 3, 2005. During the interview, Applicants' representative provided the above claim amendments and further distinguished the present invention from the prior art. Specifically, Applicants' representative noted that the cited art of record fails to teach forming a first alignment mark on a first substrate to align a conductive material relative thereto and forming a second alignment mark on a second substrate to align a sealing material relative thereto such that when the first and second substrates are joined, the conductive material is properly aligned with the sealing material. The Examiner was receptive to the proposed claim amendments and remarks, but required additional time to review the cited art of record prior to allowing the case.

Claims 1 and 4 are now pending in the application. By this amendment, Claim 1 has been amended and Claims 2-3 and 4-7 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The basis for these amendments and can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art (APA hereinafter) in view of Hida et al. (U.S. Pat No. 5,936,695).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot as it pertains to Claims 2-3 and 5-7 as Claims 2-3 and 5-7 have been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 calls for a liquid crystal device including a first substrate provided with a first alignment mark formed so as to be at least partially superimposed on a joined area between a sealing material and an anisotropic conductive material. See Specification at pg. 24, Ins. 11-25 and pg. 25, Ins. 1-2. Furthermore, independent Claim 1 recites that the second substrate is provided with a second alignment mark opposed to the first alignment mark through the joined area such that when the first substrate is bonded to the second substrate the sealing material is aligned with the anisotropic conductive material. See Specification at pg. 24, Ins. 11-25, pg. 25, Ins. 1-2, and FIGS. 3 and 4. APA and Hida fail to teach such a relationship.

Hida teaches alignment marks (371, 373 and 271, 273) formed on an array substrate (100) and a counter substrate (300), respectively. See Hida at Col. 6, Ins. 8-10 and Figure 5. Furthermore, Hida teaches using respective pairs of alignment marks to properly align pairs of substrates, noting that "the relative position between both substrates 100 and 300 is adjusted while monitoring the two sets of alignment marks 271, 273, 371, 373 and their surroundings." See Hida at Col. 6, Ins. 61-65. In this

manner, Hida fails to teach or suggest using alignment marks to properly align a sealing material or an anisotropic conductive material relative to a single substrate.

In addition, Hida fails to teach alignment of a conductive material with a sealing material in a joined region, whereby the conductive material is aligned to a first substrate by a first alignment mark and the sealing material is aligned to a second substrate by a second alignment mark.

Because Hida does not disclose alignment of a conductive material relative to a first substrate by a first alignment mark and alignment of a sealing material relative to a second substrate by a second alignment mark such that when the first substrate is joined to the second substrate, the conductive material is properly aligned with the sealing material in a joined region, and none of the cited references cures this deficiency on Hida, Applicants' invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In this manner, it is believed that independent Claim 1, as well as Claim 4, dependent therefrom, are in a condition for allowance in light of the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 3, 2005

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,882
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344
Attorneys for Applicant

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/MHS